

P337.

SPEECH
LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
AUG 1912

Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE

AT THE

REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION IN
TREMONT TEMPLE, BOSTON

ON

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1912



Issued by
THE REPUBLICAN CLUB OF MASSACHUSETTS
19 Milk Street, Boston.
SAMUEL J. ELDER, President. COURTENAY CROCKER, Secretary.

SENATOR LODGE'S SPEECH

I thank you for the honor you have done me by asking me to preside in this convention. More than once in the past have I thus been favored by the action of the Republicans of Massachusetts. I have always fully appreciated the honor but never have I valued it so highly as I do today. It is one of the pleasantest rewards of public service to be called to a conspicuous post and thereby to be placed in the forefront of a political battle when the radiance of coming victory illumines the future as the light of dawn stealing across the heavens and the rosy flush in the East foretell the rising of the sun in all its splendor to gladden an expectant world. But when the skies are dark with clouds, when storms gather, when the issue of the contest is beset with doubt, then indeed to be summoned to such a place as this brings feelings deeper far than pleasure or gratification, for the honor then becomes the mark of a trust and of a confidence which is the greatest prize that any public servant can hope to win.

Just now I am led to believe that among advanced thinkers gratitude and loyalty to a political party are at best venial weakness; at worst, little short of a crime. In this respect I fear that I am too old to learn. I still believe that loyalty and gratitude are virtues which can never go out of fashion, unless the world becomes a much sorrier and meaner place than it now is. I am profoundly grateful to the Republicans of Massachusetts, to whom I owe all that I have had in public life, and I have had much. I make this avowal with peculiar pleasure at this precise moment when it seems to have an air almost of novelty. But I am loyal to the Republican party on far higher grounds than any which even the deepest personal gratitude can furnish. I am loyal to the Republican party at this juncture because I believe that its success was never more important to the people of the United States than now. I urge you to support President Taft for re-election, I urge the support of all Republican candidates, because I believe the Republican party and no other stands in this election for principles absolutely vital to the perpetuity of free government and of those American institutions which we have always loved and praised, honored and revered. My convictions on this point are very deep and I shall only attempt to give you today my reasons for those convictions, as briefly as I can, because I feel that this is the moment of all others when each one of us should declare, so clearly that all men may know, the faith that is in him.

974 4041
1822

The first practical duty, of course, in making the fight which we are making and which we shall continue to make to the utmost of our strength, is toward the national ticket. It is to re-elect President Taft, to elect a Republican House and a Republican Senate. It is also our duty and our most immediate duty, the one closest to our hands, to elect a Republican state government. We must elect a Republican governor. We are fortunate in our candidate. Able and dignified, thoroughly trained in the business of the State, master of political questions whether economic or constitutional, a Republican and a strong supporter of the President, Mr. Walker well deserves the high honor which has come to him. He is fitted in every way to lead us to victory and, one and all, we pledge him our earnest, loyal and untiring support. Finally it is our duty, in order that the government of the state may be what it has always been, a credit to Massachusetts, to elect a Republican legislature. We must, however, do this not only for the sake of the State but for the sake of the nation, for in this particular the national and the state interests blend together. To the next legislature will be committed the great duty of electing a successor to my honored colleague, who in character and conduct, in wisdom and sagacity, in purity of motive and in devotion to the commonwealth and to the nation, has been an honor to Massachusetts and has well sustained her high tradition in the Senate. What a tradition it has been! I venture to say that there is no constituency anywhere which can show a body of representatives during a similar period equal to that which is comprised in the list of the Senators from Massachusetts. There you will find the names of Caleb Strong and George Cabot, of Timothy Pickering and John Quincy Adams, of John Davis and Rufus Choate, of Daniel Webster (facile princeps), of Charles Sumner, of Henry Wilson and of George F. Hoar. Yet these are merely the most eminent of that goodly company and there is not one among all the Senators from Massachusetts who has not been a credit, in character and reputation, to the State which sent him. Bear that list in mind when you decide who the next Senator shall be and vote for no one who is not worthy to take his place upon it.

There is not one of the Republican candidates suggested for this great office who is not fitted by character, reputation and public service worthily to sustain the credit and reputation of Massachusetts in the Senate, where the record of the State's service has been so remarkable. Between one of these Republicans and the candidate selected by the Democratic party, controlled by the present sinister influences which we all know, you must choose. No other choice is possible and no one need delude himself with the idea that there is

any escape from it. I appeal to men of all parties, without distinction, who have the honor and good name of the State of Massachusetts at heart, not to throw their votes away but to vote so that we may have a Legislature which will not suffer the great record of Massachusetts in the United States Senate to be marred—which will not allow her standard of character and reputation there to be lowered—which will not put a name into that distinguished list which those who come after us would wish to blot out but which, alas, could never be erased.

Let us now leave the candidates and come to the broader questions, on which, as I have said, I wish to give you my reasons for the convictions which I hold. I shall speak plainly and frankly, for this is the moment when we should all unflinchingly declare our honest beliefs.

We ought to test a political party in three ways; by its traditions, its composition—that is, the character of its membership—and by what it stands for at the moment. The traditions of the Republican party are to be found in the life and character of Abraham Lincoln and in the sufferings and sacrifices of the Civil War. No political party in history which has controlled the destiny of a great nation can show a nobler heritage than this. If our civilization were to end tonight and disappear as completely as the Eastern monarchies of Assyria or Chaldæ, or of the Medes and Persians, the explorer among the ruins would still find in the dim records of a buried past the monumental achievements of the men who destroyed human slavery and saved and consolidated the United States.

In its composition—that is, in the character of its membership—the Republican party has shown itself superior to any other. Its tradition implies it. The history of the United States for the last half century proves it. I do not for a moment mean to assert that the Republican party has never made mistakes or never numbered unworthy men among its adherents. Still less would I think of suggesting that there is not an abundance of honest and patriotic men in all parties, except in those organizations which seek the destruction of all government and a return to barbarism and chaos or in those others whose patriotism goes no further than the effort to take possession of the national wealth and give to each man an equal share, whether he earns and deserves it or not. If after making these two exceptions I believed that all honesty and patriotism were confined to one party I should despair of the Republic. I fully concede to those who differ from me the same sincerity and honesty of purpose which I claim for myself and my fellow Republicans. My proposition is that the mem-

bership of the Republican party has always comprised and now comprises a larger, much larger number of strong, efficient, intelligent and right-thinking men, fitted to conduct a government, than any other. To this the history of fifty years is a conclusive witness. The fact that the government of the United States has been administered by the Republican party for forty-four years out of fifty-two shows that they have known how to rule and govern, and this has been one reason for their long terms of power. The quality and capacity to which I now refer do not relate to party politics but are wholly outside of them. The first duty of every party in official control is to carry on the government of the United States. Sometimes that duty bears with it the salvation of the government, as it did with Lincoln. Sometimes it involves the conduct of a foreign war, as it did with McKinley. Ordinarily it means providing money for government expenses and conducting the vast business of the government through its various departments. That this should be done wisely and effectively is of the highest importance to the people of the United States, for whose benefit the government exists. For forty-four years since 1861 the Republicans have done this work and done it well. Under Mr. Cleveland the old habits and traditions were in the main observed. There were then experienced Democrats in both branches of Congress who knew how the daily business of government ought to be carried on and who had no intention of permitting it to be impeded. How is it today? The tradition of the Cleveland time has vanished and we have seen a Democratic House of Representatives throw the administration of government into party politics and load appropriation bills—a most vicious and dangerous practice—with every kind of legislation. They prated of economy and committed extravagances. They economized in such a way as to injure the government service where there were no votes and took money from the Treasury with reckless profusion when its expenditure might procure votes. They cut down the State Department's appropriation \$90,000, crippling it in its bureau of trade relations which is of the utmost importance to the business of the country. They cut off five cavalry regiments from our little army at a moment when the disturbed condition of Mexico stared us in the face and everyone knew that troops were needed to preserve peace on the border. They fixed a term of five and then of seven years for all persons employed in the classified service in the District of Columbia, which meant necessarily within a short time all persons employed in the government service. The employees of the government were to find themselves on the street at the end of seven years, or struggling through political influence for retention. It was

the worst blow I have ever seen struck at honest and efficient administration. It was a direct renewal of the old spoils system. We were saved from it by the veto of President Taft, who for that act alone should receive the support of every man and woman in the classified offices and of every friend of a non-political civil service. Last, and worst of all, the Democratic House cast the Navy into their party caucus. The Navy is no more a party question than our foreign relations. It is the defense of our country; the assurance of our peace. It is the American Navy, not a party Navy, and its support is a duty which patriotism demands. Although we have already dropped from second to third place among the navies of the world, although we are on the eve of the opening of the Canal which brings fresh responsibilities, the Democrats voted that we should cease from building fighting ships. The Senate voted for two and secured one in conference, which was much better than none but yet wholly inadequate. A party which for any reason will treat the great arm of the nation's defense in this manner ought on that ground alone to forfeit public confidence. Many more like attempts might be enumerated but I have mentioned enough to demonstrate that the Democratic party, as now constructed, has shown during the last eighteen months that it has no conception of the first great duty of a party in control, which is to carry on the government. The Democrats of the House have displayed a glaring incapacity in regard to administration and utter indifference to the right of the people to receive efficient and honest service from all departments of their own government. They fail to stand, as the Republican party stands, the second test to which all parties should be submitted,—the test of ability to conduct a great government.

I come now to the third, last and most decisive test to be applied to all parties at all times, and that is what the party stands for at the moment and what position it takes on the questions of the day. I say that it is the final and most decisive test because, no matter how deep the attachment, no matter how hard the wrench of parting, moments have come in all political history when a man must follow his convictions, even if they carry him away from the political associations which he has always loved and cherished. On the other hand, the duty is imperative to the conscientious man to stand by the party in which he believes, at any cost of personal sacrifice, and not fling away the obligations of a lifetime for any merely personal reason. Let us now apply the test. Severe as it is, and as it always must be, I for one have no doubt in my own mind that the Republican party at this critical hour fully meets it. In my endeavor to tell you why I feel so strongly upon this point I

shall refrain from personalities. I have never been able to rest my case in political discussion on personal abuse and I have never thought that that case was of much worth which required personal abuse to support it. We have too many, both in the press and on the platform, of those "upon whose tongues continual slanders ride." The enormous growth of personalities in political discussion in these latter days is one of the fruits of our system of primaries, because where men of the same party contest in public debate for the prize of office they have no issues to discuss but only their own individual merits or defects. It comes down, under this system, no matter how meritorious it may be in other respects, to what the old English prize-fighter said when he entered the ring: "Now, Tummy lad, it's thou or I." That mental attitude is suitable to the prize ring, but it reduces political discussion to a low and melancholy level. Therefore, I say, I shall refrain from personalities. I may by this course fail to draw forth your laughter and applause but I think that at least I shall command your respect, preserve my own and show that seriousness which men like you feel when you are called upon to deal with the grave questions, far more important than any man can possibly be, which now confront the American people and ask for decision at their hands.

The finest campaign which the Republican party has ever fought, during my life, was that of 1896, for it was waged exclusively upon two great questions of public policy. One was the tariff, an economic question involving the prosperity of the country. The other was the question of free silver, in which not merely the prosperity but the financial honor of the United States was at stake. We won all along the line. We settled the currency question and we put the financial honor of the United States beyond the reach of assault. Again today the question of the tariff is before the American electorate. I do not propose to discuss tariff details or particular schedules here today. That will be done with the greatest amplitude, and so discussed, I hope, that all men will understand it, in the many meetings which will be held before the 5th of November. All I wish to say at this time is that the Republican party stands, as it has always stood, for protection to American industries. It stands for that policy. Rates of duty are details of high importance but they do not touch the principle involved, except as they accord or do not accord reasonably and properly with that principle. The Democratic party stands for what they call a tariff for revenue only, which differs from free trade as a matter of principle only in being unjust where free trade is at least just, if injurious, to all alike. We should have protection for

all or free trade for all, but a tariff for revenue only means inevitably protection to one man and free trade to another. It is based on injustice, upon an economic fallacy which combines the defects of both systems and has the virtues of neither. If we abandon protection and go to a tariff for revenue only or to free trade, then, without reference to the merits of the opposing systems, is it certain that this change means and must mean the destruction of the present industrial equilibrium and the establishment of a new one. This is economic revolution, and industrial revolution for the establishment of a new equilibrium must bring suffering, disaster and business panic in its train, no matter what the distant and ultimate result may be. The people of this country are invited to make this tremendous change, which will be felt to the remotest corners of our land, for you cannot affect the protected industries without affecting everything else in greater or lesser degree, at a moment when the country rejoices in an unequalled prosperity. The crops are bountiful almost beyond example; business is sound, active and profitable; labor is employed at high wages, and capital and enterprise meet with a good return. If at such a moment you throw the industries into confusion, if you create doubt and uncertainty as to the conditions upon which those industries rest, the prosperity which you enjoy at this moment will fade and drop away like the leaves now falling in the forest. Instead of being the living colors of the Spring which foretell the coming of a glorious Summer, the glow of prosperity which now suffuses the land will prove to be only that last brilliant gleam which Nature sends before she spreads over the earth the white silence of winter. Think well before you take such a risk as this by committing the economic policy of the country to a party which is pledged to change it radically and completely. A sure decline in prosperity is what would follow a change, whether that change meant ultimate benefit after the passage of many years, or not; whether it was economically sound, or not, and the burden of suffering would fall most heavily upon those least able to bear it. But we Republicans hold that this change of policy is economically unsound. If you throw our markets open to the competition of the world you must meet that competition on the same conditions as those which obtain in the competing countries. The primary condition of competition in manufactured products is the cost of production. The primary and the chief element in the cost of production is the labor cost. It begins with the tree that is cut in the forest, with the clay that is dug from the ground, with the coal and iron that are mined from the bowels of the earth, with the stone which is quarried from the ledges, and extends to the

last and most complicated manufactured product which the wit of man can produce. If you do not make your labor cost substantially equal to the labor cost of your competitors you cannot stay in the market. When you abandon the principle of protection and remove the protective duties, if your industries are to live, labor costs must come down to a foreign level. You must either close your factories or you must lower your labor costs. There is absolutely no escape from the dilemma. If you close the factories you throw thousands and thousands of men out of employment and compel them to rush into other employments and reduce wages there. If you keep the factories open and force down the labor cost, you force down the American standard of wages and of living at the same time. That is the choice which lies before us so far as the tariff is concerned. I have stated the question in its broadest form and there today I leave it. There could be no graver issue so far as the material welfare of the people of the United States is concerned and it is for them to decide what they desire. If, in the hopes of benefiting by a change, which will shake our whole industrial fabric to its foundation, they think that they can ultimately improve their condition, it is for them to say so. If they are willing to venture the great prosperity which the country now enjoys, in the hope that an uncertain future, reached after years of painful experiment, will bring them a better prosperity, again it is for them to say so. It is on that issue that the Republican party takes its unchanging position that protection in principle is essential to the maintenance of our rates of wages and our standards of living, which in their turn are essential to the well being of the whole community in a government where all the people rule.

Yet the tariff, grave and important as it is, has been with us for a century and we have fought the battle many times, enduring as best we might the adversity which has always followed the abandonment of protection and rejoicing in the long periods of prosperity which have accompanied the maintenance and establishment of a protective tariff. But in the last few years other questions have arisen far more important than any tariff or any currency can possibly be, because they involve nothing less than the fundamental principles of American government. An agitation has been in progress and is now being carried on by men of both parties, whether the party division which it causes has been declared or not, which aims at and if successful can lead to nothing less than a complete revolution in our system of government. The scheme has now extended to the primaries, which are merely a part of the machinery of government and do not in themselves involve any constitutional principle.

It has been seriously proposed in this State, and I think in this State alone, to abolish party enrollment from the party primary. The proposition is a contradiction in terms. The primaries were established for the purpose of purifying and improving the methods of nominating party candidates and no others. Those who belong to no party are not compelled to enter them and have no right to do so unless they intend to become members of some party for which and for which alone party primaries exist. If you abolish the party enrollment and the party ticket and put all the names on one ballot you simply turn the primaries into a preliminary election. But at the same time you do much more than this for you would then have an arrangement by which organized minorities, belonging to any party or to none, could go into the primaries and control the nominations of all parties. In other words, under this system not only Democrats but any voters not Republicans can decide the selection of Republican candidates, and of course the same is true of Democratic candidates who could be nominated by Republican or even Prohibition votes. By this scheme we are to be deprived of the right of choosing our own candidates and the whole thing becomes a travesty on popular government. It is idle to suppose that large bodies of men who agree on certain political principles will submit to having candidates chosen for them, whose selection they cannot themselves control. My right as a citizen and the right of those who think with me to nominate our own candidates for office is a great and inalienable right which is not to be taken from us by any jugglery of the statutes. If Republicans are not to have the opportunity to select their own candidates and Democrats are not to have the opportunity to select theirs, then I say that it is the duty of every responsible political party holding well defined principles and favoring well defined policies to select its own candidates by its own voluntary methods and place their names upon the ballot on election day by nomination papers. If the party enrollment is abolished the primaries are worthless for the purpose for which they were established and it will be the duty of all responsible parties to stay outside of them and nominate their candidates themselves and then place them upon the ballot under the means provided by law. I have mentioned this point because, although primaries affect only the mechanism of government, this attempt so to arrange them, that they will become a mere vehicle for an organized minority to control all nominations, brings them at once into relation with the much more profound changes affecting fundamental principles which are now urged upon us.

The agitation of which I have spoken and which, as I have said, aims at nothing less than a complete revolution in our system of government, begins by this distortion of the primaries and then seeks to break down representative government and make the courts subservient to the will of a majority of the voters at any given moment. The first purpose is to be accomplished by the compulsory initiative and referendum; the second by the recall of judges and the reversal by a popular vote of judicial decisions. I am opposed to the compulsory initiative and referendum because I am in favor of government by the people and through majorities of the voters and I am opposed to and always shall resist to the utmost of my power any attempt to substitute for them government by minorities of the voters. If you will study carefully the compulsory initiative and referendum you will find that it is nothing but a scheme to enable minorities to rule. A small minority of the voters can initiate legislation and compel the Legislature to pass laws. Wherever the compulsory initiative and referendum have been adopted, this power of compulsory initiation has been conferred upon a small percentage of the voters. Remember at the outset that the voters themselves are only a small minority of the people. The total vote at the last presidential election was in round numbers fifteen millions and the population of the United States was ninety millions. That is, one-sixth of the people took part in the presidential election and one-twelfth determined the result. The voters are not the people. They are merely the necessary instrument selected for the expression of the popular will. But they are not the people; they are representatives and trustees. Now it is proposed to give to a small fraction of the voters—not of the people—this great power to compel the submission of laws to a popular vote and when those laws are submitted to the popular vote experience shows that they are almost invariably carried by a minority of the voters. Those who are interested in the passage of the law of course take pains to vote; a small number who are interested in the other direction vote against it, and the great mass remain indifferent. In the State of Ohio last September over eighty constitutional amendments were submitted to the people. It was practically a revision of their fundamental law involving questions of the greatest moment. Forty per cent only of the vote of Ohio, as I have been informed, was cast. Every amendment that was adopted was carried by little more than a quarter of the voters of the State. Constitutional amendments must be submitted to the people and always have been in the States, but it is monstrous that anything less than a majority of all the voters should be able to adopt a con-

stitutional amendment. We had two constitutional amendments, of no great importance, submitted in this State at the last election. Less than two-thirds, not of the voters but of those who came to the polls, voted on them, and although there was no substantial opposition to either yet they were put into our Constitution by a vote which was less than half of the votes cast for candidates. I could go on and give you case after case of a similar character and they prove beyond the possibility of doubt that the compulsory initiative and referendum is nothing in the world but a device to permit interested and organized minorities to govern. The Legislature necessarily represents all the people, whether voted for by all the people or not, and are chosen on that understanding, but the minorities of voters to which we are asked to give this power to compel the submission and the adoption of laws, in the exercise of that power represent nobody but themselves. This system of compulsory initiative and referendum means the conversion of legislatures into mere machines of record and the destruction of representative government. Representative government is the one great advance in the methods of government which has been made in modern times. Its growth, its development, its adoption in one country after another have been co-incident with the advance of political freedom, so much so that it has become almost synonymous with it. The first care of every autocrat, of every dictator, of every man who has seized on power for himself alone, has been to break down the representative body or to reduce it to a form and a ceremony. It is now proposed to abandon this great advance which has been made in modern times and return to earlier and rejected forms. It is done under the utterly false cry of "let the people rule." It is not a scheme to let the people rule; that is found in the Constitution of the United States. It is a scheme to let organized minorities of voters rule and through the devices of the law get possession of the State.

The other great bulwark of freedom has been the independent court. Until the last few years a man would almost have hesitated to have given utterance to such a truism, and now it is proposed to take from the courts their independence. It makes no difference to whom a court is subservient. When it becomes subservient to anybody outside the courtroom,—whether that influence comes from the King, from money or from a body of voters,—that court is a servile court. It no longer interprets the law, but it declares that to be the law which someone else wants. Justice from ancient times has always been figured as a beautiful woman, with bandaged eyes, holding with steady hand the scale in which all rights and wrongs

are weighed. Those who now assail the courts would drag her from her high throne in the court room and put her on the streets to solicit support from the passions of men, to which she will then become at once the victim and the toy. The independent judiciary of the United States, and of England too, taken as a whole and allowing for all the failures and defects incident to fallible human nature, has been the most potent defense and protection of the liberty of the individual man and of the rights of minorities against the oppression of majorities. I cannot here today argue this great question in detail; that would take hours instead of minutes. I merely point out to you that it is now assailed and that I do not believe that representative government and judicial independence, which have been the greatest achievements of our race in its battle for political freedom, have suddenly become dangerous to popular government. Mark well that all this agitation is directed against the representative and judicial branches of the government. I find in no program any attempt to limit the executive, and it is logical and inevitable that this should be the case. Constitutional government moves too slowly to suit some people who wish to convert it into an instrument for the quick satisfaction of their own desires and aspirations, which may be either beneficial or hurtful to the people at large. For this reason they would substitute for it a government which consists simply of the voters and executive. Go back fifty years and you find an example of a government of that sort in the Third Napoleon with his Empire based on the plebiscite. Abraham Lincoln declared at Gettysburg that the government he was trying to preserve was "a government of the people, for the people, and by the people," and that government was the government of the United States under the Constitution. On October 22, 1862, Governor Andrew, writing to Daniel Henshaw in regard to the conference of loyal Governors recently held at Altoona, said:

"In conclusion I cannot but regret the tendency I observe to obtrude matters mainly personal upon the attention of the people. It is the great cause of *Democratic, constitutional, representative government* which is now on trial."

It is the same Constitution now as it was then, except for the war amendments, and if Abraham Lincoln and John A. Andrew thought that a government of the people, which they were giving their lives to save, I do not believe that any of us need be disturbed

if we find ourselves in agreement with them. Lincoln also said, in his first inaugural:

“A majority held in restraint by constitutional checks and limitations, and always changing easily with deliberate changes of popular opinions and sentiments, is the only true sovereign of a free people.”

You observe that he says a majority under “constitutional checks and limitations.” He draws the distinction between government by the people and government by a majority of the voters. I have already pointed out the great gulf fixed between those two things and the proposition which now confronts us will, if carried out, break down government by the people, which is secured by the limitations of the Constitution, and give us over, bound and helpless, to the action of a majority of the voters appearing at any given moment,—voters who are a minority of the people and whose majority may be fleeting, temporary or accidental. It was against this precise situation that the special checks and limitations which Lincoln approved were devised by the convention over which Washington presided. Let me bring home to you just what I mean by asking your attention to the first ten amendments to the Constitution. Those amendments constitute a Bill of Rights. They have become so much a part of the life of each one of us that we think no more of them than of the air we breathe. Lest we forget, let me recall some of them to you. These amendments protect every man in his religion. There may be only two or three gathered together, but Congress can make no law to touch them. They are secure in their right to worship God in their own way. Within a few days a banner has been borne through the streets of a Massachusetts city bearing the demand: “No God—No Master.” How do you think that proposition compares with the religious freedom guaranteed to one and all by the Constitution of the United States.

To each one of you the Bill of Rights assures freedom of speech. Into the third and fourth amendments our ancestors put the principle of Coke’s great declaration that “the house of every man is to him as his castle and fortress” by securing each one of us against the quartering of soldiers and against unreasonable seizures and search warrants. In Article V. it is provided that no man shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime, except by presentment by a Grand Jury; nor be subject to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb for the same offense; nor compelled to be a witness against himself; nor deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law; and that no man’s private property

shall be taken for public use without just compensation. Article VI. secures to the accused in all criminal prosecutions speedy and public trial by jury, and he must be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation. He shall have the right to be confronted with the witnesses against him and to have compulsory processes for obtaining witnesses in his favor and the assistance of counsel in his defense. By Article VII. the right of trial by jury is secured to everyone where the value in the controversy shall exceed \$20. Article VIII. provides that excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

Think of what those provisions mean. They defend and protect each one of us in that which is dearest to us. They are the guardians of human rights, for every item there set down is one of the rights of men and none other. Could there be a greater misfortune than to have these famous clauses weakened, broken, mutilated or destroyed? Whose rights do they protect,—the rights of majorities? On the contrary, they are the protection of the individual man and of small minorities of men against the power of majorities. Who are to interpret those provisions and say whether the laws passed by a majority of voters infringe or not upon these great guarantees of liberty? The courts; the courts alone can secure us in the rights which the Constitution gives us. Get rid of representative government, get rid of the courts, and you find yourself at the mercy of any momentary majority of the voters, a minority of the people,—usually a minority fraction of all the voters entitled to vote. Your life, your liberty, your property, are left at the discretion of a majority of the voters which may be accidental, fleeting, temporary, without any chance for that second thought or that appeal to another tribunal which were secured to each one of us by the founders of the Republic. The Constitution is not a law. It is a declaration of principles. The effort now is to turn it into a statute, to be altered by the whim or the passion of the moment. The Constitution guards the rights of each one of us, no matter how humble or how poor. I say to you beware how you allow any man or any men to lay their hands upon that great instrument. It has been the admiration of the world. We have prospered and thriven and been an example to mankind under its beneficent provisions which created a self-limited democracy, something which until that day men had thought impossible of accomplishment. Do not let it be torn down for if you do all the great advance in freedom which it represents will perish and we shall return to those primitive forms of government which in ancient times and in modern times as well have oscil-

lated between anarchy and despotism, with at best only brief intermissions of true and ordered liberty.

I look over the field of politics today and I see but one party which stands for the Constitution and for the principles upon which the Constitution rests. That party is the Republican party. To say that this attitude is incompatible with progress is to utter a childish absurdity. Every great piece of legislation, all the progress which has been made in the last fifty years has been achieved under the guidance of the Republican party. From the beginning, when we freed the slaves and saved the Union down to the present day, all the legislation which has marked an advance in government and a real progress in the direction of benefitting and helping all the people, has been placed upon the statute books by Republican congresses and Republican presidents. We are today, as we always have been, a party of sane and rational progress under the Constitution. We do not believe that breaking down the Constitution is progress. We regard it as revolution and retrogression, and upon that firm ground we take our stand. What if the odds be great and the enemies come from all sides? A brave man fights all the harder when he finds great odds in front of him and he wins in the end if his cause is right and his courage high. So must it be with a brave party when as with us their cause is righteous and their principles are just. Parties come and go but principles survive. If a party is true to its principles it will profit by victory and like Antaeus from the earth rise stronger from defeat. It will survive defeat and live on to win more victories and achieve a future which shall be as brilliant and as useful as its past. But if it abandons its principles, if it shrinks from the test, if it stops to count the odds, then defeat indeed is terrible and it will never look on victory again. There are worse things than defeat. To sacrifice principles and cast aside convictions is much worse. "Not failure but low aim is crime." Those who battle for the right will snatch victory from the jaws of defeat and from the nettle danger pluck the flower safety. We fought against the extension of slavery in 1856 and lost. But we stood firm to our principles and in 1860 we won. For four years we did battle for the Union and for the Constitution, which made the Union, and again we won. Once more we are called upon to defend the Constitution. That duty is our greatest heritage and our noblest hope. The cause of ordered liberty, of government by the people, and of human rights, is ours and we shall be victorious under the standard of the Constitution which passed triumphant through the ordeal of civil war. We will fight the good fight once more, even as our fathers did, and once more we shall win.